arXiv:1212.2683v1 [quant-ph] 12 Dec 2012

Sequential measurements of non-commuting observables with quantum controlled interactions

Holger F. Hofmann*
Graduate School of Advanced Sciences of Matter, Hiroshima University,
Kagamiyama 1-3-1, Higashi Hiroshima 739-8530, Japan and
JST, CREST, Sanbancho 5, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0075, Japan

The origin of non-classical correlations is difficult to identify since the uncertainty principle requires that information obtained about one observable invariably results in the disturbance of any other non-commuting observable. Here, this problem is addressed by investigating the uncertainty trade-off between measurement errors and disturbance for measurement interactions controlled by the state of a single qubit that can realize any quantum coherent superposition of a fully projective measurement and the identity operation. It is shown that the measurement statistics obtained from a quantum controlled measurement of $\hat{A}$ followed by a projective measurement of $\hat{B}$ can be explained in terms of a simple combination of resolution and back-action errors acting on an intrinsic joint probability of the non-commuting observables defined by the input state of the system. This complex-valued joint probability is consistent with the complex-valued probabilities that have been derived from weak measurement statistics, indicating that the results of weak measurements are also valid at intermediate measurement strengths once the effects of back-action are properly taken into account.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Wj, 42.50.Dv

According to textbook quantum mechanics, the precise measurement of a physical property instantaneously changes the state of the system to an eigenstate of that property. This “collapse” of the state eliminates all quantum coherences between alternative measurement outcomes, resulting in an irreversible loss of information. To reduce the loss of information associated with a quantum measurement, it may be useful to reduce the precision of the measurement, resulting in a trade-off between the resolution of the measurement and the disturbance caused by the measurement back-action on the initial state [1–6]. However, the precise relation between back-action and resolution is itself a difficult quantum mechanical problem, since the error free initial values of the properties concerned cannot be accessed and evaluated by direct observation [7–12].

Interestingly, a well-defined pattern emerges in the limit of weak measurements, where the measurement resolution is so low that the back-action does not appear to alter the output statistics [13]. It is then possible to consider the average measurement results for an observable $\hat{A}$ as values conditioned equally by initial state $\mid \psi\rangle$ and final measurement outcome $\mid b\rangle$,

$$\langle \hat{A}\rangle_{\text{weak}} = \frac{\langle b \mid \hat{A} \mid \psi\rangle}{\langle b \mid \psi\rangle}. \tag{1}$$

Significantly, weak values do not depend on the specific realization of the weak measurement interaction and can therefore be regarded as intrinsic expectation values of the observable under the conditions expressed by the combination of initial and final states [14]. The weak values of projection operators $\mid a\rangle\langle a \mid$ can then be interpreted as conditional probabilities, and the initial quantum state can be identified with the joint probability of weak measurement projection a and final measurement result b [15–17]. The structure of weak values requires that these joint probabilities are given by complex numbers, which may seem to be rather counterintuitive. However, the appearance of complex expectation values in quantum mechanics is a direct consequence of the product of non-commuting self-adjoint operators in the Hilbert space formalism. Moreover, the imaginary parts describe the effects of transformations between the quantum states [18, 19], and the negative real parts provide a possible explanation of quantum paradoxes [20–25]. It may therefore be possible to regard the complex joint probabilities observed in weak measurements as a more direct and fundamental description of the relation between non-classical correlations and transformation dynamics that is encoded in the non-commutative algebra of Hilbert space operators.

If the complex statistics of weak measurements does provide a more fundamental description of correlations between non-commuting observables, it should be possible to explain a much wider range of measurement results in terms of the complex probabilities defined by the weak values of projection operators. In fact, weak values have already been used to identify the values of observables before a measurement, permitting an evaluation of resolution and back-action for the specific setup [26, 27]. Arbitrary measurement processes can then be described in terms of complex conditional probabilities relating the actual measurement results to the eigenstates of the corresponding physical properties before the measurement [27]. Unfortunately, the results presented in [26, 27] seem to indicate that the effects of the measurement back-action strongly depend on the specific realization of the measurement interaction. As a consequence, the statistics of measurement errors can be rather complicated and difficult to interpret. An unambiguous separation of measurement noise and intrinsic probabilities in the experimental data therefore requires a particularly simple and controllable realization of measurement interactions.

In recent work, we have shown that a sufficiently simple error model can be constructed for measurements on a two level system, where all possible errors can be described by random spin flips [25]. The results clearly demonstrate that the joint probability defined by the weak values of the input state consistently explains the measurement statistics obtained at all possible measurement strengths. However, the generalization of this result to multi-level systems is not a straightforward matter, since the number of possible error syndromes increases rapidly with the dimensionality of the Hilbert space describing the quantum system.

In this letter, I point out that a particularly simple trade-off between measurement back-action and resolution can be obtained in a quantum controlled measurement of a d-level system, allowing an unambiguous separation of measurement noise from the intrinsic probabilities of the observables. If a control qubit is used to implement a coherent quantum superposition of zero interaction and fully projective measurement, the measurement errors are limited to only two distinct patterns: the resolution error given by a completely random selection of the measurement outcome, and the measurement back-action, given by the conditional probability distributions defined by the projection of the initial state onto the eigenstates of the different outcomes. The joint probabilities for the outcomes of a quantum controlled measurement of $\hat{A}$ followed by a precise measurement of $\hat{B}$ can then be separated into a sum of contributions associated with a fully projective measurement, a back-action free assignment of a random measurement result, and a third contribution that corresponds to the complex joint probabilities obtained in weak measurements. Interestingly, the complex joint probability appears as interference term in the superposition of projective measurement and identity operation selected by the control qubit measurement. When the control qubit output indicates maximal constructive interference between the possibilities, the real part of the complex joint probability contributes maximally to the experimentally observed statistics, whereas the imaginary parts appear directly in the joint statistics when the control qubit output indicates phase differences of $\pi/2$ in the superposition. Thus quantum controlled measurements not only show how weak values can be obtained at any measurement strength, but also provide an elementary illustration of the fundamental relation between measurement uncertainties and quantum coherence.

Let us first consider a quantum controlled measurement of a d-level system, where the state of a single qubit decides whether a fully projective measurement of $\hat{A}$ is performed or not. In either case, there will be a measurement result A_a associated with an eigenstate $\mid a\rangle$ of the observable $\hat{A}$. However, if no measurement was performed, the result will be completely random, with a probability of $1/d$ for each of the d outcomes a. The effect of the quantum controlled measurement can then be described by a measurement operator $\hat{E}(a)$ that acts on the input states of system and control qubit according to

$$\hat{E}(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\hat{I}\otimes \mid 0\rangle\langle 0 \mid + \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid \otimes \mid 1\rangle\langle 1 \mid, \tag{2}$$

where $\hat{I}$ is the identity operator of the d-dimensional Hilbert space.

If the input state of the control qubit is an equal superposition of $\mid 0\rangle$ and $\mid 1\rangle$, all possible quantum superpositions of projective measurement and identity operation can be selected by an appropriate measurement on the control qubit output. The operation on the system associated with the successful post-selection of a specific output state $\mid \theta, \phi\rangle$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}_{\theta,\phi}(a,1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\langle(\theta,\phi) \mid \hat{E}(a) \ \ (\mid 0\rangle + \mid 1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\cos\theta \hat{I} + \mathrm{e}^{i\phi}\sin\theta \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $(a,1)$ indicates a measurement result of a followed by a successful post-selection of the control qubit in the corresponding superposition of $\mid 0\rangle$ and $\mid 1\rangle$. The strength of the quantum controlled measurement varies between zero at $\theta = 0$ and a fully projective measurement at $\theta = \pi/2$, where intermediate strengths are represented by a quantum coherent superpositions of projection and identity.

For maximal measurement strength ($\theta = \pi/2$), the operator $\hat{S}_{\pi/2}(a,1)$ projects the system onto an eigenstate $\mid a\rangle$, completele removing any coherence between the eigenstates of $\hat{A}$. This back-action will change the experimentally observable statistics of a non-commuting observable $\hat{B}$ by essentially changing the distribution of eigenvalues B_b associated with eigenstates $\mid b\rangle$ from the probabilities $\langle b \mid \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}} \mid b\rangle$ of the input state $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}}$ to the probability distribution $|\langle b \mid a\rangle|^2$ conditioned by the measurement outcome a. In the limit of zero measurement strength, there is no back-action and the initial probability distribution $\langle b \mid \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}} \mid b\rangle$ can still be observed in the output. The transition between zero measurement strength and a fully projective measurement can therefore be described by the joint probabilities $p(a,b,1)$ of the measurement result a and the result of a final projective measurement b obtained at $0 < \theta < \pi/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}p(a,b,1) &= \langle b \mid \hat{S}_{\theta,\phi}(a,1)\ \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}}\ \hat{S}^{\dagger}_{\theta,\phi}(a,1) \mid b\rangle \\ &= \frac{(\cos\theta)^2}{2d}\langle b \mid \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}} \mid b\rangle + \frac{(\sin\theta)^2|\langle b \mid a\rangle|^2}{2}\langle a \mid \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}} \mid a\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{\sqrt{d}}\ \ \mathrm{Re}\left(\mathrm{e}^{i\phi}\langle b \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{in}} \mid b\rangle\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

As indicated by the phase dependent contribution to the experimentally observable probability given in Eq.(4), the transition between weak and strong measurement is characterized by quantum interference between the projective measurement and the identity operation. In the limit of weak measurement ($\theta \ll 1$), this interference term can be used to derive the complex weak values of the projection operators $\mid a\rangle\langle a \mid$ by subtracting the zero strength result and normalizing the remaining contribution,

$$\langle(\mid a\rangle\langle a \mid\rangle_{\text{weak}} = \frac{\langle b \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} \mid b\rangle}{\langle b \mid \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} \mid b\rangle}. \tag{5}$$

It has already been widely discussed that the weak value of the projector given in Eq.(5) can be interpreted as the conditional probability of a for the final measurement outcome b. In particular, this interpretation is at the heart of all resolutions of quantum paradoxes in terms of experimentally determined negative probabilities [20–25]. However, Eq.(4) shows that the relevant contribution to the measurement statistics not only appears in the weak limit, but is observed at *any* measurement strength of the quantum controlled measurement. Specifically, the joint probability of a and b can be recovered at arbitrary values of θ by subtracting both the contribution associated with a zero stength measurement and the contribution associated with the fully projective limit. The complex joint probability obtained from this compensation of resolution and back-action errors reads

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(a,b) &= \langle b \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} \mid b\rangle \\ &= \text{Tr}\left(\mid b\rangle\langle b \mid a\rangle\langle a \mid \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

As mentioned above, this complex joint probability has previously been discussed as part of the statistical interpretation of weak values [15–17]. Interestingly, its history goes back much further than the theory of weak measurements, originating from the formal definition of a complex phase space distribution by Kirkwood in 1933 [28] and Diracs generalization to arbitrary pairs of observables in 1945 [29]. In fact, the operator product of the projectors $\mid a\rangle\langle a \mid$ and $\mid b\rangle\langle b \mid$ is the quantum mechanical equivalent of a logical “AND” since it represents the product of the truth values for the statements a and b. It is therefore logically consistent that a reduction of measurement errors should reveal a contribution that corresponds to this complex joint probability. In the quantum controlled measurement, it emerges directly as a seemingly error free contribution to the joint probability observed in a sequential measurement of a and b. This appearance of a complex joint probability in a positive and real measurement probability is possible because all negative contributions originating from $\rho(a,b)$ are invariably “covered up” by the contributions from measurement errors and back-action, indicating that measurement uncertainties may be necessary because fundamental quantum correlations would otherwise result in the appearance of negative probabilities in experimentally observable results [25, 30]. It may therefore be interesting to take a closer look at this relation between complex joint probabilities and measurement errors in quantum controlled measurements.

To get a clearer impression of how the measurement results are related to the intrinsic statistics of the quantum state, it is helpful to express the measurement statistics of a quantum controlled measurement of $\hat{A}$ followed by a projective measurement of $\hat{B}$ entirely in terms of the complex joint probability $\rho(a,b)$. When the results usually rejected in the post-selection are included, the total probability distribution of the measurement outcomes reads

$$\begin{aligned} p(a,b,1) &= \frac{(\cos\theta)^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{d}\rho(b)\right) + \frac{(\sin\theta)^2}{2}\left(|\langle b \mid a\rangle|^2 \rho(a)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{\sqrt{d}}\,\text{Re}\left(\text{e}^{i\phi}\rho(a,b)\right), \\ p(a,b,0) &= \frac{(\sin\theta)^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{d}\rho(b)\right) + \frac{(\cos\theta)^2}{2}\left(|\langle b \mid a\rangle|^2 \rho(a)\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{\sqrt{d}}\,\text{Re}\left(\text{e}^{i\phi}\rho(a,b)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\rho(a) = \sum_{b'} \rho(a,b')$ and $\rho(b) = \sum_{a'} \rho(a',b)$ are the marginal probability distributions of a and b. Eq.(7) thus indicates that measurement errors can be represented by the reduction of the joint probability $\rho(a,b)$ to its marginal probabilities, which corresponds to a randomization of the observable in the sum. The contribution of $\rho(a)$ represents back-action errors, since $\rho(a,b')$ contributes to outcomes with $b \neq b'$, indicating a back-action induced transition from b' to b. Likewise, the contribution of $\rho(b)$ represents measurement erros in a, since $\rho(a',b)$ contributes to outcomes with $a \neq a'$.

The error free contribution of $\rho(a,b)$ originates from quantum interference and depends on the phase ϕ of the control qubit readout. Since these contributions can be negative, measurement uncertainties are necessary to ensure that the experimental probabilities remain positive. To ensure that Eq.(7) results in positive probabilities for all values of θ and ϕ, the complex joint probabilities must satisfy the inequality

$$|\rho(a,b)|^2 \leq |\langle b \mid a\rangle|^2 \rho(a)\rho(b). \tag{8}$$

As comparison with Eq.(6) shows, this relation corresponds to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for the coherence between the (non-orthogonal) states $\mid a\rangle$ and $\mid b\rangle$ and is therefore satisfied for all complex joint probabilities defined in this manner. In fact, the joint probabilities of pure states satisfy this condition exactly, resulting in experimental probabilities of $p(a,b,1) = 0$ whenever the phase ϕ differs from the phase of the complex probability by π. Therefore, any reduction of the measurement errors below the limit defined by the quantum controlled measurement is impossible, since it would necessarily result in negative probabilities for the actual measurement results of pure state inputs. Quantum controlled measurements thus represent an optimized trade-off between measurement resolution and back-action and the measurement uncerainties are at the absolute minimum required to avoid paradoxical predictions.

As mentioned above, it is possible to determine the complex joint probability of an unknown quantum state by subtracting the measurement noise associated with resolution and back-action uncertainties. However, Eq.(7) indicates that there is a more direct way of identifying the contribution from the complex probability by including both possible outcomes of the control qubit measurement. Since the complex probability appears in the experimental results as a quantum interference between the output states $\mid 0\rangle$ and $\mid 1\rangle$ of the control qubit, it defines the difference between the probabilities of two orthogonal outcomes in the equatorial plane of qubit states with $\theta = \pi/4$. According to Eq.(7), this difference between the probabilities of the orthogonal control qubit outputs at a phase of ϕ is given by

$$p(a,b,1) - p(a,b,0) = \mathrm{Re}\left(\mathrm{e}^{i\phi}\rho(a,b)\right). \tag{9}$$

Eq.(9) shows that the phase of the complex joint probability $\rho(a,b)$ appears directly in the output polarization of the control qubit conditioned by a sequential measurement of a and b, while the absolute value determines the difference between the relative frequencies of the outcomes for observations along the polarization axis. It is therefore possible to use the control qubit output as a two dimensional meter indicating the complex value of the joint probability associated with a sequential measurement outcome of a and b by its output polarization.

In summary, quantum controlled measurements give particularly direct access to the complex joint probabilities associated with the operator product of projectors describing measurement outcomes for non-commuting observables in Hilbert space. The joint probability appears directly as a significant contribution to the experimentally observable joint probabilities obtained in a sequential measurement of a and b, and is easily distinguished from effects of measurement uncertainties by the dependence on control qubit phase. This phase dependence shows that the joint probability is obtained from a quantum interference between projective measurement and identity operation, highlighting the fundamental relation between quantum coherence and measurement dynamics in the trade-off between resolution and back-action. Significantly, the interference between projective measurement and identity operation results in an error free joint probability consistent with the results previously derived from weak measurements. The noise background associated with measurement errors and back-action can be explained in terms of the same joint probability, simply by assigning appropriate probabilities to the random scattering between the initial values of a and b and the final measurement results. The fact that the different measurement results obtained at variable measurement strength can thus be explained in terms of the same joint probability describing the intrinsic statistics of the input state supports the conclusion that these complex probabilities provide a valid description of the measurement independent correlations between non-commuting properties in the quantum formalism. Moreover, the unavoidable trade-off between measurement resolution and back-action can be explained by the need to compensate the negative contributions of the intrinsic joint probability with a positive probability noise background. Quantum controlled measurements thus illustrate the fundamental role of quantum coherence in the measurement process and provide a particularly direct illustration of how the quantum correlations of non-commuting observables define the uncertainty limits of quantum measurements.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24540427.

---

[*] hofmann@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

[1] K. Banaszek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1366 (2001).
[2] T. C. Ralph, S. D. Bartlett, J. L. OBrien, G. J. Pryde, and H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012113 (2006).
[3] R. Filip, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 032311 (2011).
[4] M. Iinuma, Y. Suzuki, G. Taguchi, Y. Kadoya, and H. F. Hofmann, New J. Phys. **13**, 033041 (2011).
[5] E. Nagali, S. Felicetti, P.-L. de Assis, V. D'Ambrosio, R. Filip, and F. Sciarrino, Scientific Reports 2, (2012).
[6] Y. W. Cheong and S.-W. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 150402 (2012).
[7] M. Ozawa, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042105 (2003).
[8] A.P. Lund and H.M. Wiseman, New J. Phys. **12**, 093011 (2010).
[9] J. Dressel, S. Agarwal, and A. N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 240401 (2010).
[10] J. Dressel and A.N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 230402 (2012).
[11] J. Erhart, S. Sponar, G. Sulyok, G. Badurek, M. Ozawa, and Y. Hasegawa, Nature Physics **8**, 185 (2012).
[12] G.C. Knee, S. Simmons, E.M. Gauger, J.J.L. Morton, H. Riemann, N.V. Abrosimov, P. Becker, H.-J. Pohl, K.M. Itoh, M.L.W. Thewalt, G. A.D. Briggs and S.C. Benjamin, Nat. Commun. **3**, 606 (2012).
[13] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert, and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351 (1988).
[14] H. F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 012103 (2010).
[15] L. M. Johansen, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 012119 (2007).
[16] J. S. Lundeen and C. Bamber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 070402 (2012).
[17] H. F. Hofmann, New J. Phys. **14**, 043031 (2012).
[18] H. F. Hofmann, New J. Phys. **13**, 103009 (2011).
[19] J. Dressel and A. N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 012107

(2012).

[20] K. J. Resch, J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Lett. A **324**, 125 (2004).

[21] N. S. Williams and A. N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 026804 (2008).

[22] J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 020404 (2009).

[23] K. Yokota, T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, New J. Phys. **11**, 033011 (2009).

[24] M. E. Goggin, M. P.Almeida, M. Barbieri, B. P. Lanyon, J. L. O'Brien, A. G. White, and G. J. Pryde, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **108**, 1256 (2011).

[25] Y. Suzuki, M. Iinuma, and H. F. Hofmann, New J. Phys. **14**, 103022 (2012).

[26] R. Mir, J. S. Lundeen, M. W. Mitchell, A. M. Steinberg, J. L. Garretson, and H. M. Wiseman, New J. Phys. **9**, 287 (2007).

[27] A. P. Lund and H. M. Wiseman, New J. Phys. **12**, 093011 (2010).

[28] J. G. Kirkwood, Phys. Rev. **44**, 31 (1933).

[29] P. A. M. Dirac, Rev. Mod. Phys. **17**, 195 (1945).

[30] As shown in H. F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 020408 (2012), weak measurement statistics also appear in quantum cloning, where the cloning errors cover up the negative joint probabilities. In the present context, cloning could thus be interpreted as an alternative strategy for joint measurements.